

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SUSAN MAE POLK,
Plaintiff,

v.

DEPUTY JAMES CAVIN, et al.,
Defendants.

No. C 08-1483 MMC (PR)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE
JUDGE'S ORDER OF SEPTEMBER 13,
2012**

Before the Court are plaintiff's "Objections to Magistrate's Order Denying Motion to Compel Compliance by Newspapers with Plaintiff's Subpoena Duces Tecum," filed October 1, 2012, and plaintiff's "Objections to Order by Magistrate Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Forensic Medical Group to Comply with Subpoena Duces Tecum," also filed October 1, 2012.¹ By said filings, plaintiff objects to the denial of two motions to compel, which denials are included in the Magistrate Judge's order of September 13, 2012.


Having read and considered the above-referenced objections, the Court hereby DENIES the objections, for the reason plaintiff has failed to show the Magistrate Judge's

¹Also before the Court is plaintiff's "Request for an Extension of Time to Respond with Objections to Magistrate's Order Denying Motions to Compel & for Further Briefing," filed by plaintiff September 28, 2012, by which plaintiff seeks an extension of time to file objections to the Magistrate Judge's order of September 13, 2012. Because the objections were due no later than October 1, 2012, see 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), 6(d), the date on which plaintiff filed her objections, plaintiff's request for an extension of time is DENIED as moot.

1 denials of the above-referenced motions to compel are clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
2 See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) (providing district court may reconsider magistrate's order
3 where it has been shown to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law).

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5
6 Dated: October 15, 2012

7 
8 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28